

Docket JP920010326US1

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTERAppl. No.: 10/736,343  
Filed: December 15, 2003

SEP 28 2006

**In the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

In re the application of:  
 Rajendra K. Bera )  
 )  
 Filed: 12/15/2003 ) Group Art Unit: 2183  
 )  
 For: Run-Time Parallelization ) Examiner: Ryan Paul Fiegle  
 of Loops in Computer )  
 Programs )  
 )  
 Appl. No.: 10/736,343 )  
 )  
 Applicant's Docket: )  
 JP920010326US1 )

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile  
 to the United States Patent Office on the date indicated by my signature below.

*Anthony V.S. England* 9-28-2006  
 Anthony V.S. England Date

**REMARKS RESPONSIVE TO TELEPHONE INTERVIEW**

The following remarks are responsive to a telephone interview with Examiner Fiegle on September 21, 2006.

**Item 1**

In the interview, Examiner Fiegle questioned whether there is support in the original specification for the limitation in claim 1, for example, regarding "none of the respective numbers of pattern values exceeds three regardless of how many statements are in the loop." The following analysis is intended to more clearly explain claim 1, so that it is clear how the specification provides support for the claim language.